

Date: Wed, 2 Feb 94 04:30:12 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #35  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Wed, 2 Feb 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    35

Today's Topics:

ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses  
Novice...or Advanced Roundup?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 1994 23:14:56 GMT  
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!  
gatekeeper.es.dupont.com!esds01.es.dupont.com!  
COLLINST%esvx19.es.dupont.com@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARRL's Lifetime Amateur licenses  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <199401311402.GAA25135@ucsd.edu>,  
William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:  
>> I'm in favor of both Code and \*Tougher\* written tests,  
>> (not by VE's but the old fashion way in front of the  
>> FCC.) Unlike others here who want to include the  
>>|Thomas Collins <WI3P> | Don't know what's up there, Beyond the sky." |  
>  
>Thomas -- why are you insinuating that the VE system is somehow not tough?  
>  
>under this program i can now make a different test for \*everyone\* our group  
>tests. there's more questions and a regular local schedule (at 2 - 3 sites

I'm not about to get into another \*long\* thread about testing.

I'll just say that anyone with half a brain can \*memorize\* the group of questions today and in just a few sittings have any class of Ham license they desire. The only \*real\* work is learning the code. (And no, I'm not going to get into that debate either!)

I'm not slamming the VE's, they are to be commended for giving of their time, just the \*TEST\* materials themselves.

Thanks & 73 | "Get your facts first, and then you can  
Tom WI3P | distort them as much as you please."  
collinst@esvax.dnet.dupont.com | Mark Twain  
\*\*\* MY EMPLOYER DOESN'T SPEAK FOR ME NOR I FOR THEM \*\*\*\*

-----  
Date: Mon, 31 Jan 94 21:02:37 -0500  
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!  
news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Novice...or Advanced Roundup?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Randy...

Contest contacts fit into such a narrow formula that they are frequently held at speeds higher than normal for the operators involved...particularly the CQ's.

..Neil, N3DF

-----  
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 1994 13:42:02 GMT  
From: brunix!maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CKI4to.H7q@cscsun.rmc.edu>, <1994Jan31.205218.930@cs.brown.edu>,  
<1994Feb1.081612.1318@beacons.cts.com>, Å  
Subject : Re: Antenna Lawsuit

In article <1994Feb1.081612.1318@beacons.cts.com>, kevin@beacons.cts.com (Kevin Sanders) writes:

|> Of course nobody forces me to purchase a house with CC&Rs. Nobody forces  
|> me to purchase a house at all. If property ownership in this country has  
|> degenerated into a forum wherein the robot-members of our society who  
|> delight in molding others into their own image can wield the real power,  
|> then we might as well give it all to the government.

Then stop whining and vote with your pocketbook, and educate others to do the same.

|> Abolish private  
|> property ownership, and the CC&R's all go away, to be replaced with  
|> government regulations which can't possibly be as asinine as some of  
|> the brain-farts I've seen come out of homeowners' associations.

Never underestimate the stupidity of a government bureaucrat.

|> What good is full disclosure? Taken to the logical extreme, all it  
|> means is that I will know in advance that I can't buy \*any\* property  
|> without putting up with the robots.

Full disclosure means that you will have the ability to know, in advance of the P&S agreement process, whether or not a property has any CC&Rs. A seller is required by law to reveal any "latent defects" with the property - CC&Rs need to be treated as latent defects, since they restrict what you can and cannot do with the property should you purchase it.

| Don't tell me that there are  
|> properties available without CC&R's attached. I know that, I happen  
|> to live in one. Fewer and fewer non-restricted properties are available  
|> with each passing day. Take your ideas to their logical extreme, where  
|> CC&R's become as commonplace as the title itself; what do you have?  
|> Can you say "caste system"? I knew you could.

The more people are educated as to what CC&Rs really are, the more they will "just say no". If more people started walking away from property with CC&Rs, then developers wouldn't place such assine restrictions on their properties.

I like the approach one person is talking - basically, filing suit against a CC&R restriction using an anti-trust approach.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan  
-- Population Studies & Training Center  
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912  
-- (401) 863-7284

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #35

\*\*\*\*\*